



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Smith's Dictionary of Classical Antiquities, the editor of which evidently regarded it as valid. On page 206 the numeral of the footnote is misplaced. In the paper entitled The Evolution of the Letters of our Alphabet Professor Abbott applies very skillfully the theory of evolution to the development of letters. This scientific theory can undoubtedly be applied to certain questions of interest in classical archaeology, particularly to the development of letters in the study of palaeography. Unfortunately, however, Professor Abbott is wrong in his reference to the form of the letter Q. He declares that "The form which we find in the earliest Latin inscriptions is a circle, or an oval approaching very closely to a circle, with a tangential affix drawn horizontally to the right from the bottom of the circle". Later on, he declares that "out of a variant developed a form in which the pendant was drawn downward". The form with a downward pendant is in fact the original and is the form found in the earliest Latin inscriptions, as seen in the Duenos inscription in the Forum Inscription, and in the first inscription in Ritschl's P. L. M. E. It is the form of the Greek prototype. It is, therefore, inexact to say that the form with the tangential affix to the right is that found in the earliest Latin inscriptions.

There are a number of other statements which follow in this paper which do not produce full confidence as to their correctness, and although Professor Abbott's theory is undoubtedly sound, yet it can hardly be said that he maintains it successfully in his treatment of the letter Q.

COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY.

JAMES C. EGBERT.

Costume in Roman Comedy. By Catherine Saunders. New York: The Columbia University Press (1909). Pp. 145. \$1.25.

This volume appearing in the comely dress of the Columbia University Series of Studies in Classical Philology bears, by editorial preface, the special commendation of Professor Peck's *imprimatur*.

Under the captions of Sources, Terminology, Prologus, Stock-rôles, and Unusual Rôles the author presents in methodical discussion the chief evidence, literary and artistic, for the conventions of Roman comic costume, and has contributed essentially to the interesting subject of Roman scenic antiquities. The literary sources are professedly the plays of Plautus and Terence, Euanthius, Donatus, Pollux and "scattered references mainly from Roman literature", with which has been coordinated the artistic evidence of the illustrated manuscripts of Terence, Pompeian wall-paintings, Campanian reliefs, statuettes and Roman terra-cottas. In the use of the illustrated manuscripts and of the comedians themselves for the purpose in hand, Dr. Saunders

has found her chief task and one essentially new, though Van Wageningen's chapter *De histrionis vestitu* (Scaenica Romana, 1907), of which I find no mention, anticipated, in intent at least, the work upon the miniatures. Since the estimate of the scenic values of these must vary with the opinion of their origin and the age represented by them, critical consideration is given to the theories involved, to which is appended the conclusion from the present study, "that the artist of the archetype was really attempting to represent Greek costumes, such as were worn in *fabulae palliatae*, but that either he did not understand the simplest principles of Greek dress or his illustrations have been copied by persons who were decidedly ignorant of those principles" (p. 13). The discussion of the date of this archetype does not advance beyond the *pros* and *cons* of the question to the expression of a positive opinion. Though it is thought that the "signs of ignorance" present in all of the four principal manuscripts may discredit the theory of a "very early" date for the original, due allowance is made for the supposition of an ancient original which has been blunderingly transmitted. Unless it be shown that these signs are, in given cases, *common* to all the manuscripts concerned, there seems little reason to extend the blame for these faults to an "original artist". On the other hand, by assuming an original *factor* contemporaneous with the known period of stage presentations, and ignorant *librarii* of the dates of the miniatures themselves, the main characteristics of the pictures can in great measure be satisfactorily explained. While therefore the study does not seem to justify the claim of Professor Peck's prefatory appreciation that "it goes far in itself to disprove the extravagant beliefs once held in their (i. e. the miniature's) antiquity", it has amply demonstrated by scholarly analysis their many inconsistencies and lack of coherent testimony. There is insufficient recognition of the special inferiority of O for the discussion of costume, yet Dr. Saunders has used the pictures, so far as accessible in reliable reproductions, with great skill and insight into the significance of the crude attempts at portraiture. It remains perhaps to be regretted that it has been impossible to follow an altogether comparative method of investigation by which more positive evidence might have been possible for the authority of the supposed scenic tradition.

The discussion of terminology involves consideration of *choregus*, *ornamenta*, *choragium*, *ornatus*, *ornare*, *exornare*, *vestimentum*, *vestis*, and *vestitus*, and reaches (p. 26) a pitfall in the categorical statement that "*vestimentum* occurs but once in Terence, in Haut. 141". Verse 903 of the same play shows the word, relieved of formulaic strictures.

Errors in type are *Cappodox* for *Cappadox* (p. 63), *pedisegui* for *pedisequi* (p. 123), *Cleareta* for

Cleæreta (p. 61), *Palestrio* for *Palaestrio* (p. 115) and the omission of a colon after *excepto* (p. 76).

The seemingly exhaustive citation of the testimony of Plautus and Terence leaves opportunity to wonder that certain references were omitted, yet the evidence of careful compilation leads to the impression that such were disregarded rather than overlooked. Other pertinent matter might have been cited from the scholia of the minor source, Donatus, and the barrenness of categories relieved by the introduction of more illustrative material from the general literature. The writer has, however, achieved her essential aims with laudable thoroughness and given by dependable method a useful compendium of interesting information.

PRINCETON UNIVERSITY.

JOHN W. BASORE.

The *Trinummus* of Plautus. Edited with Introduction and Notes, by H. R. Fairclough. New York: The MacMillan Company. (1909.) Pp. xxxiv+118. 60 cents net.

This is a compact edition with brief notes, on the same plan as the earlier volumes in the series appearing under the direction of Professor J. C. Egbert. The text is in substantial agreement with that of Leo (1896) and that of Lindsay (1903). A few other readings adopted may be mentioned: *face*, 174; *vestipica*, 251; *opperiam*, 391; *satillum*, 492; *hac*, 857.

An introduction of some length deals with the Life and Works of Plautus; Prosody; Meter; and the Plot of the *Trinummus*. An interesting feature is an analysis of the Canticum, vss. 223-300, based on Leo's *Plautinische Cantica und die Hellenistische Lyrik* (1897)—the first instance of the sort, as far as I know, in any edition in English.

It is cause for some surprise that the language of Plautus is not discussed in this introduction; its archaisms in forms and syntax, and its wavering and unstable character are not even alluded to here. If it is in harmony with the general plan of brevity in the series to devote fourteen pages to minutiae of prosody and meter, it surely would have been consistent—and an economic use of space as well—to devote at least half that number of pages to an outline sketch of the chief linguistic peculiarities, such as Professor Fairclough has included in his edition of the *Andria* of Terence (pp. lxxi-lxxxi). As it is, the Notes are continually stating classical equivalents for the archaic forms, with rarely a hint or explanation of the real relation of the two, and with no attempt to group such peculiarities under any broad classifications of phonetic development. This is an omission that most teachers will regret. A brevity that demands the omission of such a sketch should also have excluded the sketch given of meter and prosody.

The Notes are relatively generous, covering about

as many pages as the text itself; they show the influence of Brix's edition. There is a considerable repetition of statements on archaic forms, as just remarked. The notes on forms constitute the weakest and most disappointing feature of the whole book. They are frequently so worded as to be not easily understood, or even misleading; sometimes they omit such saving qualifications as 'usually' or 'generally', or are even questionable in point of fact. The following quotations from the Notes will show some of these inadvertences, and some other matters worthy of notice.

37. "*odiossae*: archaic for *odiosae* through an intermediate *odionsus*". *Odionsus* is of course first in the series, not second.

60. "*faxo* (*fac-so*) is really an aorist subjunctive with future force". This is better than the common statement that such forms are future perfect. Another explanation is that such forms *are* futures, out and out; what Sommer says in his *Handbuch* (pp. 624, 625) approximates closely to this.

86. "The passive infinitive in *-ier* is used by Plautus only at the end of a line." As a matter of fact, it occurs medially in Mil. 1073, Cas. 220, 723 (all anapaestic); and in Men. 1006 and Poen. 742 (both iambic).

108. The comment on the measurement of *eius* is misleading. A very careful statement is that in the revised Lane, 133 (2).

112. "*ipsus=ipse*, the latter being a weakened form". This is little less than astounding. "Die nominale Endung [ipsos, ipsus] scheint alt zu sein, ohne dass ein Grund für diese Eigentümlichkeit aufzufinden wäre" (Sommer, p. 460). Even clearer is the statement of Lindsay (*Lat. Lang.*, p. 441).

176. The unique syntax of this verse is passed over without mention.

297. This verse is called (p. xxx) an anapaestic dimeter, and the editor, following Leo's note, says that "*uiuito*, a cretic word . . . which is perhaps pronounced as a dissyllable". This seems more than doubtful; cf. Lindsay, *Captivi*, editio maior, p. 22. This verse is called a cretic tetrameter catalectic in the small Götz-Schöll edition (v. 295 in their numbering).

324. "*autumo* is a lengthened form of *aio*". So says the Harper Lexicon of 1879, to be sure. The attractive etymology of Wharton (*aii-tumo*, cf. *δφι ο*), accepted by Lindsay (*Lat. Lang.* pp. 180, 235), is rejected by Walde (p. 58); but whether *autumo* comes from *autem* (so Zimmermann, with Walde's approval) or not, to derive it from *aio* is certainly not to be thought of.

436. "*duint* — — used only at the end of a verse". Yet *perduit* (Poen. 740, iambic), *duint* (Pseud. 937, anapaestic), and *perduit* (Men. 451, trochaic) all occur medially.